Claim 20

Claim 20, ln. 9, requires using a source signal to estimate a pore pressure. The Examiner alleged that Widrow "discloses VSP used to measure and estimate calculate [sic] seismic properties that can include pore pressure from reflection coefficients in lines 20-35 of column 7." Office action at 9, para. 2. The Examiner further alleged that Widrow discloses "[s]teps for using the source signal 12 and receiver signal 22 in figure 1 to estimate a formation property (the pore pressure) from at least on formation in lines 50-60 of column 1..." Office action at 9, item C. Applicants assert that Widrow, whether at col. 7, ln. 20-35; col. 1, ln. 50-60; or elsewhere, does not use or suggest the term "pore pressure" or the estimation thereof or the ability to estimate pore pressure.

Applicants assert, therefore, that Widrow does not show or suggest using a source signal to estimate a pore pressure. For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants assert that claim 20 is not anticipated by Widrow and request that the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Applicants believe that it is not necessary at this time to rebut the Examiner's other allegations regarding claim 20, but hereby expressly reserve the right to do so in the future if appropriate.

Claim 21

The Examiner alleged that "[w]ith regard to claim 21, [Widrow] steps [sic] of monitoring parameters of the wellbore and estimate calculate [sic] properties including wellbore safety margins using the BHA precise focusing feature in line 20 of column 25." Office action at 10, para. 1. Applicants assert that Widrow—whether at col. 25, ln. 20 or elsewhere, whether in connection with the Widrow focusing feature or not—does not show or suggest estimation of wellbore safety margins.

Claim 21 requires using pore pressure to monitor wellbore pressure safety margin. The Examiner alleged at 10, item C, that Widrow shows the estimation of pore pressure. For reasons set forth above in connection with claim 20, applicants assert that Widrow does not show or suggest pore pressure estimation and that claim 21 is therefore not anticipated by Widrow. Applicants request that the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 22-24

The Examiner alleged that "[w]ith regard to claim 22, [Widrow] discloses steps for used [sic] to measure and estimate calculate [sic] seismic properties that can include parameters of drilling lubricant computed from reflection coefficients in lines 20-35 of column 7." Applicants assert that Widrow does not show or suggest drilling lubricant parameters, the estimation thereof, or the computation thereof from reflection coefficients.

Claim 22, ln. 9-10, requires using pore pressure to specify a drilling mud weight. The Examiner alleged at 11, items C and D, that Widrow shows the estimation of pore pressure. For reasons set forth above in connection with claim 20, applicants assert that Widrow does not show or suggest pore pressure estimation and that claims 22-24 are therefore not anticipated by Widrow. Applicants request that the rejection of claim 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Applicants believe that it is not necessary at this time to rebut other allegations made by the Examiner in connection with claims 1-24, but hereby expressly reserve the right to do so in the future if appropriate.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections of the claims have been traversed, that claims 1-24 are patentable, and that this application is in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request a prompt and favorable action.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric C. Woglom, Registration No. 25,445 Gene W. Lee, Registration No. 55,369 Thomas J. Vetter, Registration No. 30,597 Edward M. Arons, Registration No. 44,511

Attorneys for Applicants

Fish & Neave IP Group Ropes & Gray LLP Customer No. 1473 1211 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036-8704

Phone: 212.596.9000 Fax: 212.596.9090